

Remarks:

This amendment is submitted in an earnest effort to advance this case to issue without delay.

The priority papers were filed with the original application papers and their receipt was acknowledged in the above-mentioned Examiner's Action. The undersigned hereby reiterates the priority claim made in the earlier-filed Declaration.

The specification has been amended to eliminate some minor obvious errors. No new matter whatsoever has been added.

Claim 1 has been amended to define the invention with somewhat greater particularity over the art. The subject matter of now canceled claim 3 has been inserted in claim 1, along with the statement that the support (11) is horizontal and vertically reciprocal, as described in the original application text on page 6 at lines 16 through 19. The combination of these features allows a blank to be pivoted through 90°, here from a vertical position to a horizontal position, in the smallest possible space according to blank size. Thus even a large-format blank can be pivoted basically in a space not significantly longer than itself. A comparison of FIGS. 1-4 which show the machine with large blank and the support 11 raised and FIGS. 5-7 which show a small blank and

the support 11 lowered makes this action clear. In addition a new claim 10 describes how the flattened blanks are oriented in generally vertical planes perpendicular to the direction in the supply.

The sole cited reference, US patent 4,279,609 of von Wichert, shows a similar machine that is constructed differently and that operates differently. To start with, the pivot axes of the two arms shown in FIGS. 1 and 2 are parallel to the transport direction, not transverse to it. Thus there is no way to accommodate blanks of different length other than by setting up the machine for the biggest possible blank. In addition there is nothing resembling a vertically displaceable support on which the blanks can be set, so once again the possibility of adjustment to save space with small blanks is ruled out. A §102 on von Wichert is therefore impossible. Since this reference deals with the same general technology and comes up with a distinctly different solution, it is not seen how there is any suggestion here to reorient the grab arms and supply so that a §103 rejection is similarly out of the question.

The remaining cited but not applied references are even further afield and do not warrant further discussion here.

Thus all the claims in the case are clearly in condition for allowance. Notice to that effect is earnestly solicited.

If only minor problems that could be corrected by means of a telephone conference stand in the way of allowance of this case, the examiner is invited to call the undersigned to make the necessary corrections.

Respectfully submitted,
The Firm of Karl F. Ross P.C.



by: Andrew Wilford, 26,597
Attorney for Applicant

27 September 2004
5676 Riverdale Avenue Box 900
Bronx, NY 10471-0900
Cust. No.: 535
Tel: (718) 884-6600
Fax: (718) 601-1099

Enclosure: None.